REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 21 and 29-32 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks.

Request For Reconsideration of the Finality of the Office Action

The present Office Action was made final. Respectfully, Applicants believe that a Final Office Action is premature in that claim 21 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on newly cited art, wherein claim 21 was not amended in the previous response. A second or any subsequent action on the merits in any application should not be made final if it includes a rejection, on newly cited art, other than information submitted in an information disclosure statement of any claim not amended by applicant in spite of the fact that other claims may have been amended to require newly cited art. Claim 21 was not amended in the previous response and was rejected in view of newly cited art, Nicholson et al. and May et al., not submitted in an information disclosure statement. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's withdrawal of the finality of the present Office Action.

Response to Arguments

Claims 1, 2 and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,150,996 to Nicholson et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,501,441 to Ludtke et al. The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Nicholson and Ludtke teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1, 2 and 29.

Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, "a display connected to the host, the display displaying an image, wherein said host transfers packetized image data to the display, said display includes a panel control processor for processing the packetized image data and a panel memory for storing processed image data, wherein the processed image data in the panel memory is displayed as the image, wherein the packetized image data comprises a header identifying the panel control processor and a body including the image data." Claim 29 claims, *inter alia*, "a panel for displaying an image; an image data receiving means for receiving image data from a host device which executes an application; a plurality of panel control processors, coupled to said image data receiving means, for processing said image data received from said image data receiving means and displaying a processed image on said panel, wherein said image data comprises a header identifying a first panel control processor from among the plurality of panel control processors; and a panel memory coupled to the first panel control processor for storing the processed image data."

Nicholson teaches a sign system for changeable signs (see Abstract). Nicholson teaches the separate handling of addresses of display modules and data or bit maps (see Figure 21; blocks 308-312 for addressing and block 326 for a bit map). Nowhere does Nicholson teach or suggest, "packetized image data comprises a header identifying the panel control processor" as claimed in claim 1 or "image data comprises a header identifying a first panel control processor from among the plurality of panel control processors" as claimed in claim 29. Indeed, as noted in the Final Office Action, Nicholson is silent about the packet of information having a specific header that identifies the panel control processor and a body including the image data. Therefore, Nicholson does not teach or suggest image data comprising a header identifying a processor, essentially as claimed in claims 1 and 29.

7

Ludtke teaches a master device logically partitioning an image section; sending a configuration command to inform a display device capable of partitioning, which image section it is responsible for, and for a display device not capable of partitioning, transmitting an encoded stream of data over an appropriate channel (see col. 19, lines 36-52). Ludtke does not teach or suggest packetized image data comprising a header identifying the panel control processor, essentially as claimed in claims 1 and 29. Ludtke teaches a master device transmitting information to different display devices on respective channels. A channel as taught by Ludtke for transmitting data to different display devices is not a header identifying a panel control processor, essentially as claimed in claims 1 and 19. For example, by using different channels, the master device of Ludtke dictates which display devices receives what data, whereas with a header identifying a panel control processor, all devices may receive data, but only those devices having the panel control processor identified in the header would display the data. Nowhere does Ludtke teach including a display device identification in a header. Respectfully, it is also noted that in the Final Office Action Ludtke is quoted at page 4, lines 17-20, however, Applicants have been unable to identify the quoted language in Ludtke. Applicants therefore believed that Ludtke fails to cure the deficiencies of Nicholson.

The combined teachings of Nicholson, and Ludtke fail to teach or suggest, "packetized image data comprises a header identifying the panel control processor" as claimed in claims 1 and 29.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1. Claim 2 is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 1. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 30 and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nicholson in view of Ludtke as applied to claim 29, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,828,383 to May et al. The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Nicholson, Ludtke and May teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 30 and 31.

Claims 30 and 31 depend from claim 29. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 29. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 4 and 32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nicholson in view of Ludtke as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,323,854 to Knox et al. The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Nicholson, Ludtke and Knox teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 3, 4 and 32.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1. Claim 32 depends from claim 29. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given from claims 1 and 29. At least claims 3 and 32 are believed to be allowable for additional reasons.

Claim 3 claims, "wherein said host transfers image data showing a first resolution to said display based on an output from an application executed with the first resolution, and said display scales said transferred image data having the first resolution to that having a second resolution higher than the first resolution." Claim 32 claims, "wherein said image data receiving means receives image data having a first resolution, and said first panel control processor scales said image data to a second resolution different from said first resolution."

In the Final Office Action, it is noted that the Nicholson-Ludtke combination is silent about said host transfers image data showing a first resolution to said display and said display

scales said transferred image data from having the first resolution to that having a second resolution.

Knox teaches a method for performing decompression of video data (see col. 5, lines 13-31). Knox does not teach or suggest scaling image data at an image data receiving means or display side, essentially as claimed in claims 3 and 32. Knox's decompression does not change a resolution of the image data; clearly, the terms "scale" and "compress" have different connotations. For example, even assuming "lossy" compression is used, a loss of data and corresponding loss of resolution would occur on a host side; thus, no scaling would occur upon decompressing the data on a display side. Therefore, Knox fails to teach or suggest "said display scales said transferred image data" as claimed in claim 3 or "said first panel control processor scales said image data" as claimed in claim 32. Thus, Knox fails to cure the deficiencies of the Nicholson-Ludtke combination.

The combined teachings of Nicholson, Ludtke and Knox fail to teach or suggest "said display scales said transferred image data" as claimed in claim 3 or "said first panel control processor scales said image data" as claimed in claim 32. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 21 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nicholson in view of May. The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Nicholson and May teach all the limitations of claim 21.

Claim 21 claims, *inter alia*, "image data receiving means for receiving color image data of a first number of bits and monochrome image data of a second number of bits different from the first number of bits from a host side, wherein the color image data and monochrome image data have been formatted as three dot data, the three dot data including

10

identification bits for discriminating between said color image data and said monochrome image data."

Nicholson teaches a sign system for changeable signs (see Abstract). As noted in the Final Office Action, Nicholson is silent about two types of display data and discriminating between two types of data based on identification bits written to memory. Nicholson does not teach or suggest writing identification bits to said panel memory for discriminating between said color image data and said monochrome image data, and executes image data processing based on the identification bits, essentially as claimed in claim 21.

May teaches reading display data from the same area in display memory and processing the display data as video pixel data or graphics pixel data depending on the state of at least one tag bit stored with the data (see Abstract). May does not teach or suggest "the color image data and monochrome image data have been formatted as three dot data, the three dot data including identification bits for discriminating between said color image data and said monochrome image data" as claimed in claim 21. May's method includes storing video data and graphics in the same area of memory, wherein the video data and the graphics include a tag bit indicating which pixel data format is used for each corresponding byte of display data (see col. 4, lines 37-47). Nowhere does May teach monochrome image data formatted as three dot data and including an identification bit for discrimination the monochrome data, essentially as claimed in claim 21. Therefore, May fails to cure the deficiencies of Nicholson.

The combined teachings of Nicholson and May fail to teach or suggest "the color image data and monochrome image data have been formatted as three dot data, the three dot data including identification bits for discriminating between said color image data and said

11

monochrome image data" as claimed in claim 21. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including claims 1-4, 21 and 29-32, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Mailing Address:
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889